

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102 for being anticipated. Claims 1, 2, and 10-14 remain in the application.

The rejection for anticipation was based on Ngu. In the Request for Continuing Examination (RCE), applicants incorporated the amendment that was requested in the response to the final rejection. This amendment was to the independent claims to clarify that the loading of the data did not wait until the prefetch was complete. For example, claim 1 was amended to include the phrase, "without waiting for completion of the step of placing the first data in the line in the cache and onto the data bus." The Examiner interpreted Ngu as disclosing that operation. Applicants' respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation.

In response to Applicant's assertion regarding column 8, lines 29-43, the Examiner stated that applicants misinterpreted the reference because the particular DAR (data access request) in that portion of Ngu referred to a second request. Applicants, however, agree that Ngu is referring to a DAR that is a second request in this section of the text. That interpretation does not affirm the Examiner's interpretation that Ngu teaches loading the line in the cache (segment in the buffer memory) as the data blocks come in without waiting for all of the data from the prefetch. This second request of Ngu is, if there is a buffer miss, compared to the range of the prefetch to see if the data is already being prefetched. If so, then Ngu "waits for completion of the present prefetching access and returns to step 64 for the expected buffer memory hit." Notice that the text does not even say something like; waits until the particular requested memory block has been received and loaded, which would have been more appropriate if Ngu did not wait until all of the data was received before loading the data blocks in the segment. The actual teaching of Ngu implies that there is no point in looking for the data in the buffer memory until the prefetch is complete, which in turn implies that the segment is loaded only after the prefetch is complete.

Further Ngu describes at column 6, lines 7-12, that a prefetch of a plurality of blocks of data in which the blocks are stored at the beginning of a segment (line) and subsequent prefetched data blocks are written in consecutive order through the end of the segment. Thus Ngu makes it clear that even if the data is received out of order, which is a distinct possibility when multiple resources (12, 14, and 16) are receiving the memory request as shown in FIG. 1 of

Ngu, the loading is done in order. The only reasonable explanation to ensure that the described operation does occur is that Ngu loads the data only after the completion of the prefetch.

Thus there are at least two reasons, the operation in response to the second request and the required loading order, to think that Ngu does not operate in the manner claimed by applicants, and applicants have not been able to find any statement in Ngu that contradicts applicants' view of Ngu's operation. Accordingly, applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinct from Ngu.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc. Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: Vimes I Clings

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 30,163

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854
Email: Jim.Clingan@Motorola.com

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 2 4 2003.

**OFFICIAL**